

## REMARKS

Independent claim 17 has been replaced with new claim 36. Claim 36 is identical to previous claim 17 except a clerical error in Formula (I) has been corrected. All previous incarnations of the claims and the description recited carbazole units. The use of fluorene units was a clerical error which arose from omission of the nitrogen atom.

Claim 35 has been added and claim 26 deleted. Claim 35 includes the same limitations as claim 26, but uses language which makes it more clear that the units of the polymer of the active material are the carbazole group and optionally the specified comonomers.

No new subject matter has been added.

The examiner has rejected claims 17 to 25 under 35 U.S.C. §112 on the grounds that the claims contain matter that was not described in the specification as originally filed. Claim 17 has been replaced with claim 36, which is identical to previous claim 17 except for the correction of a clerical error in Formula (I). Specifically, the fluorene units have been replaced with carbazole units. The use of carbazole units is consistent with the specification as originally filed. The application respectfully submits that claims 36 and 18 to 25, the latter claims having been rejected solely because of their dependency on previous claim 17, now comply with 35 U.S.C. §112.

The examiner has rejected claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §112 on the grounds that the claim is indefinite for reciting subject matter inconsistent with the claim on which it depends. The applicant respectfully submits that the claim 18 is now consistent with the claim on which it is dependent, since the clerical error previously found in claim 17 has been corrected in claim 36.

The examiner has rejected claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. §112 on the grounds that the claim is indefinite for reciting subject matter inconsistent with the claim on which it depends. The applicant respectfully submits that the claim 19 is now consistent with the claim on which it is dependent, since the clerical error previously found in claim 17 has been corrected in claim 36.

The examiner has rejected claims 26 and 29 to 34 under 35 U.S.C. §112 on the grounds that claim 26 fails to identify the compound being claimed and instead only recites a precursor thereto.


Claim 26 recites that the first active material is a polymer, and that the polymer is a reaction product of the compound given in Formula (II) and optionally of a second comonomer. The applicant respectfully submits that the language used in previous claim 26 is one method of defining a polymer. However, although previous claim 26 specified that the reaction product is a polymer, in order to avoid confusion as to whether the carbazole groups undergo solely a polymerization reaction claim 26 has been replaced with new claim 35. New claim 35 uses language which the applicant believes makes it more clear that the polymer is composed of carbazole groups and optionally the specified comonomers.

Claims 29 to 34 have been amended to be dependent on new claim 35.

The applicant respectfully submits that new claim 35 fully identifies the first active material within the claimed device, and that claims 35 and 29 to 34 comply with 35 U.S.C. §112.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that the claims as amended herein are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and action to this end is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
S. Mark Budd  
Registration No. 53,880  
Agent of Record

MARKS & CLERK  
P.O. Box 957, Station B  
Ottawa, ON K1P 5S7 (613)236-9561